



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/595,145	05/03/2007	Bo Ekstrom	P18227-US1	3318
27045	7590	04/06/2011	EXAMINER	
ERICSSON INC. 6300 LEGACY DRIVE M/S EVR 1-C-11 PLANO, TX 75024			CHENG, CHI TANG P	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2463	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/06/2011	ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

kara.coffman@ericsson.com  
jennifer.hardin@ericsson.com  
melissa.rhea@ericsson.com

CONTINUATION of 3. NOTE: Claims 1 and 5 have been amended to include the new limitation "each extra port corresponding to a particular new session". These claim amendments introduce new issues and would require further search and consideration.

CONTINUATION of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

As mentioned above, the new claim amendments would require further search and consideration.

Also, Applicant argues on page 4 of the Response that the cited references do not teach the presently recited limitation "assigning an extra port to the media-handling node for each new session that is transported through the node" because "the cited portion of Albers does not indicate that the number of interface modules, the number of interface units, or specifically the number of interface units that connect to an enforcement agency terminal are dependent on the number of session transported through the 5ess switch" and that "one of ordinary skill in the art would understand the plain meaning of the claim language to require a different extra port assigned for each new session".

The examiner respectfully disagrees. As Applicant's arguments above were also presented in its previously submitted response, the examiner's previous response

addressing these arguments are also repeated here. In particular, as indicated previously by the examiner, the broadest reasonable interpretation of the particular limitation at issue above do not require that the number of extra ports be dependent on the number of sessions transported through the node or that the extra ports be distinct or unique for each session. In other words, there appears to be no requirement that there be a one-to-one relationship between the extra ports and the number of sessions. Thus, the rejection with respect to the limitation at issue above is maintained.

With respect to the newly added limitation "each extra port corresponding to a particular new session", Applicant should be advised that further consideration (and search) would be required to determine whether this limitation encompasses only embodiments wherein there is a one-to-one relationship between the extra ports and the transported sessions and wherein the extra ports are unique and distinct.

/DERRICK FERRIS/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2463